




Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting**September 29, 2014****9:30 AM – 3:30 PM****Regional San Offices, Sunset Maple Room****10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827****Remote Access via WebEx (please note the change in number and access code)****Call In Number: 1-877-701-6739 Access Code 271 695 7****WebEx Address:**<https://waterboards.webex.com/waterboards/j.php?MTID=ma9a1a51f57e5ffb1d81200363acd311c>**Draft Agenda**

1.	Introductions Establish quorum Order lunch		9:30 Brock Bernstein Thomas Jabusch
2.	Announcements from Committee Members		9:35 Brock Bernstein
3.	Approve agenda and summary (Attachment) Agree on agenda and approve July 14 meeting summary	 14July2014 Draft SC Meeting Summary.docx	9:45 Brock Bernstein Thomas Jabusch Meghan Sullivan
4.	Discussion: Program Funding The discussion will focus on how to allocate the estimated program cost of \$1.5M for the first year across the represented sectors. Program staff will provide additional information on the costs of various administration and operation tasks, including data management. <u>Desired outcome:</u> - Mutual understanding of program funding needs - Initial recommendation for cost allocations		9:50 Brock Bernstein

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree on procedure and information needs for a decision on how to allocate cost in Year 1 by November 		
5.	<p>Discussion: Criteria for adequate participation Review and discuss proposed draft criteria structure</p> <p><u>Desired outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify remaining information and discussion needs and decide on process for finalizing criteria 	 DRAFT Adequate Participation.doc	11:20 Brock Bernstein
6.	Lunch break		12:20
7.	<p>TAC update: status of monitoring design TAC co-chairs and program staff will provide an update on progress, status, and planned next steps for completing the monitoring design.</p> <p><u>Desired outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The update is mainly for informational purposes but will allow vetting of provisional recommendations 		12:50 Joe Domagalski Stephen McCord Thomas Jabusch Jay Davis
8.	<p>Decision: Committee roles and responsibilities Review and discuss changes in Roles and Responsibilities document providing more specifics about the roles of the TAC co-chairs and SC co-chairs. One outcome from the previous meeting was to agendize further discussion and a decision about who will fill the TAC co-Chair role after the design phase</p> <p><u>Desired outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mutual understanding of the “job descriptions” for the SC and TAC chairs - Decision on TAC chairing post-design phase 	 DRAFT Delta RMP Committee Roles.doc	1:50 Brock Bernstein Thomas Jabusch
9.			2:40

	SC Transition to co-Chairs The SC agreed to target an election of co-chairs at the next meeting. <u>Desired outcome:</u> - Agree on procedure for election		Brock Bernstein
10.	Plus/Delta, set dates and agenda topics for upcoming meetings		3:15 Brock Bernstein
11.	Adjourn		3:30

Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

July 14, 2014

9:30 AM – 3:30 PM

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Building

Sunset Maple Room

10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827

Draft Summary

Attendees:

Voting Steering Committee (and/or Alternate) members present¹:

Kenneth Landau, Regulatory – State (Central Valley Water Board)

Tim Vendlinski, Regulatory – Federal (USEPA)

Gregg Erickson, Coordinated Monitoring (Interagency Ecological Program)

Dave Tamayo, Stormwater, Phase I Communities (Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership)

Stephanie Reyna-Hiestand, Stormwater, Phase II Communities (City of Tracy)

Linda Dorn, POTWs (SRCSD)

Josie Tellers, POTWs (City of Davis)

Margaret Orr, POTWs (City of Stockton)

Stephanie Fong, Water Supply (SFCWA)

Others present:

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

Thomas Jabusch, SFEI-ASC

Jay Davis, SFEI-ASC

Philip Trowbridge, SFEI-ASC

Brian Laurensen, LWA/Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership

¹ Name, Representation (Affiliation)

Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley Water Board

Dalia Fadl, City of Sacramento

Vyomini Upadhyay, SRCSD

Karen Ashby, LWA

Joe Domagalski, USGS

1.	Introductions A quorum was established.
2.	Announcements from Committee Members Jay Davis provided an update to the Steering Committee about the 2015 State of the Estuary report that is currently underway. He suggested that the TAC should play at least an advisory or review role with the water quality portion of the document because it is an important information product and it is crucial to make sure it presents an accurate picture of the system. This type of product becomes even more powerful if there is consensus amongst those involved and coordinating to support the findings. Stephanie Fong relayed the connection between the State of the Estuary report and the Monitoring Council's Estuaries Workgroup Portal and reiterated that Meghan Sullivan regularly participates in the Estuaries Workgroup. Gregg Erickson announced that IEP is undertaking a Director's review to consider the various requirements for monitoring and it would be useful to get input from the Delta RMP TAC about what monitoring is useful and will aid the information needs. Ken Landau confirmed that he is retiring in November and that the Water Board plans to hire his replacement soon to allow for a few months of overlap before Ken's departure.
3.	Approve Agenda and Summary There were no comments on the agenda or the 19 May meeting summary.
4.	TAC Update: Status of Monitoring Design Joe Domagalski provided progress updates from the TAC and its four subcommittees and the near-term plans. Tables designed to capture the subcommittee's decisions and progress in relation to answering the management questions were distributed to Steering Committee members in hard copy. The subcommittees are working towards constituent-specific monitoring designs but

	<p>are looking for linkages between sites. The consolidation of the design and the proposed core sites will be discussed at the next TAC meeting.</p> <p>In general, the initial monitoring plan will focus on a core monitoring design for each priority constituent but also identify special studies needed to answer initial questions, with the proposed pathogen study being much more targeted than the other elements and somewhere in-between. Finalizing the monitoring plan will involve negotiating the needs of the Steering Committee, the needs identified by the technical subgroups, and the interests of additional partners. Overall, the monitoring interests and regulatory drivers for each of the subgroups are considerably different.</p> <p>Mercury – For the mercury subgroup, the monitoring design will link with the TMDL process and needs as well as support the development of a mercury model based on DSM2. Work is in progress to refine proposed sites that relate to historic fish tissue monitoring sites and to connect fish monitoring with water monitoring.</p> <p>Nutrients – There is no clear regulatory driver to inform the nutrient monitoring design development. However, nutrients are implied as a factor involved in various undesirable conditions (macrophytes, species shifts, low DO). The nutrient element would build heavily on on-going work by others (e.g. ongoing SFEI and USGS studies as well as Regional Board studies) in order to put information and future actions in context. As such, the subcommittee is proposing to spend resources on a synthesis and analysis, including a station analysis, rather than create a new monitoring design plan for nutrients. However, if there is a strong rationale for “piggy-backing” nutrients or nutrient-associated parameters to the proposed new monitoring or continuing efforts, such “no-regret actions” would be included as part of the ultimate design plan that is brought back to the Steering Committee. Some members of the SC suggested a full literature review may be helpful in addition to an analysis of existing information and the work currently underway.</p> <p>Pesticides – the current use pesticides subcommittee is developing a toxicity-based monitoring element, corresponding to the need to understand how the combination of pesticide active ingredients (AIs) + AI degradates + formulation “inert” ingredient(s) + their degradation products + any other potential toxicants overlying in the water and sediment (e.g., heavy metals) contribute to toxicity. The initial design plan would vary based on the ultimate amount of funding available,</p>
--	---

	<p>but the plan is to include sampling at least five times a year (at key events – dry, wet, etc.) at sites there are mostly consistent with those proposed by the discharger community for ambient monitoring stations. The proposal includes a mix of initial screening followed by some chemical analyses as well as sites with chemical analysis at the start. For water column testing, the design proposes the traditional three toxicity test species plus <i>Hyalella</i>. For sediment testing, the design proposes coordination with the SWAMP SPoT program, which uses <i>Hyalella</i> and <i>Chironomus</i>.</p> <p>The SC expressed concern about the expansion of the scope of the design from tracking the status and trends of current use pesticides to a broader tracking of the status and trends of toxicity as well as about the inclusion of TIEs in the program. The pesticide subcommittee has some additional meetings planned to refine the design.</p> <p>Pathogens – the main purpose of the proposed monitoring element for pathogens would be confirming that there would be no increase in <i>Cryptosporidium</i> and <i>Giardia lamblia</i> numbers in drinking water supplies due to changes in source water. The proposed RMP contribution would be to fund pathogen analyses for the proposed work plus coordination of any subsequent special studies, as Municipal Water Quality Investigations (MWQI) would be doing the majority of the sampling. The first year of the proposed study would primarily be a status and trends study, while the second year would look further into potential impacts and perform detailed sampling at locations where problems were identified. The pathogens subcommittee was looking to get feedback on the amount of detail in the design. The SC agreed that brevity is key but more detail is suggested in relation to budget needs and the specific questions to be answered.</p> <p>The current plan is that the TAC and SFEI-ASC would report back by October with an initial design of a consolidated initial “no regrets” monitoring plan that would be expected to hold up in a peer review.</p>
5.	<p>Decision: TAC Roles and Responsibilities</p> <p>A revised version of the roles and responsibilities document was present that included additional clarification on the roles of the TAC Co-Chairs and information on the roles and responsibilities of the implementing entity (which is ASC at this point). Staff clarified that the TAC Co-Chairs have considerably more work to do</p>

	<p>now than they will in the future just due to the developing nature of the monitoring design.</p> <p>Steering Committee members suggested further revisions to the document, including language articulating the need to facilitate decisions and not just document them and explicitly referring to the development of meeting agenda and materials. SC members also suggested a clearer link to the organization of the RMP and suggested a roster be included, which would provide consistent naming of groups involved. Discussion about the liaison between committees indicated a need to further clarify the roles and the overlap between the TAC Co-Chairs and the implementing entity and revisit the need for TAC Co-Chairs after the design period is completed.</p> <p>Staff also presented a scorecard used in the Bay RMP as a tool to track progress in terms of goals and deliverables. The Bay RMP SC has found the card to be an efficient way to stay on track and it is quickly reviewed at the end of each meeting. The color-coding provides focus for what needs more discussion. The SC supported the concept of improved tracking.</p> <p><u>Outcomes/recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Implement a dashboard type tracking tool to improve tracking of deliverables and timelines – Revise and refine the roles and responsibilities document further – Revisit the TAC Co-Chair role and who fills that role
6.	<p>Action: Funding for Stephen McCord</p> <p>Stephen's funding for serving as a TAC co-Chair has ended. Joe Domagalski (USGS) is salaried and currently not receiving additional funding to serve as a TAC co-Chair. Thus, a discussion was sought about the additional funding required for Stephen (~\$25K) to continue as a TAC co-Chair.</p> <p>The SC agreed that the hours and tasks presented in a scope of work were reasonable, but the costs clearly indicate the need to transfer the role once the design phase is completed. Regional San has agreed to pay half of the proposed costs for the scope of work and to reevaluate the situation in October, wherein if progress is satisfactory, Regional San would likely fund the remaining portion of the tasks in the scope of work.</p>

	<p>The SC asked to have a future agenda item about the TAC Co-Chairs and whether agency or in-kind staff should fill that role and/or ASC. The discussion needs to also better define who will be the liaison between the SC and the TAC. As part of this, meeting decisions need to be more clearly documented and confirmed both in the moment and in the meeting summaries.</p> <p><u>Outcomes/decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Staff will clarify and specify the job descriptions of the TAC co-chairs and staff – The terms of the initial TAC co-Chairs and TAC will end upon completion of the initial monitoring plan. – Decisions and directives will be more clearly identified – Add an agenda item about to the next meeting about who will fill the TAC Co-Chair role after the design phase
7.	Lunch
8.	<p>Discussion: ASC Contract</p> <p>Staff provided an overview of the workplan for the current ASC contract and a roadmap for RMP development. The workplan included some very preliminary cost estimates for various tasks to give SC members a better understanding of the larger picture and seek input for tasks that should be prioritized with the current funding.</p> <p>The contract requires completion of two key products, the monitoring design and the multi-year program plan. With these products and the current meeting frequency, there isn't much money for other tasks included in the workplan. Discussion centered on the range of budget costs for the program and some of the tasks, such as data management and peer review that would be slightly more phased. The variety of issues related to data management indicated a potential need for an additional TAC subcommittee to explore these issues in more detail and to have a discussion about data management and QA/QC protocols for the program.</p> <p>The overview showed the variety and extent of tasks needed and brought to attention the projected funding required to start up the program versus the funding presently committed and available, while highlighting some of the key deliverables and potential opportunities to leverage certain tasks for the program.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendation:</u></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Provided a clearer picture of the costs of the program and a mutual understanding of the scope and duration of the existing funding – Document the contributions that have already been made – Review the report from the data summit, when available, to get direction for the process of data management within the context of the Delta RMP
9.	<p>Discussion: Program Funding</p> <p>Staff provided an overview of the potential funding models for the program, detailed in a previously prepared strawman that was distributed prior to the meeting. As the program has developed, it has become clear that the simplest option to fully fund the program through efficiencies across existing monitoring programs is not feasible in the Delta, even though it could provide some program funding.</p> <p>Characterizing the costs of the minimum ambient monitoring required to fulfill current permit requirements is a complicated and ongoing task. The plan is to look at costs in aggregate and to identify benefits to participants. Staff noted that regardless of the monitoring, the program would have a certain amount of “overhead” related to administration, data management, analysis and reporting.</p> <p>As discussion turned to how different sectors would contribute (i.e. cash or in-kind contributions), the decision was made to set a budget number for planning purposes. Participants agreed \$1.5 Million was a good number for the first-year budget of the program. Participants agreed to have more discussion within each represented sector to see how close to the \$1.5 Million they can reasonably get with contributions. The next meeting will continue discussion about program funding and begin discussion how to allocate the costs of the program across the represented sectors.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – For planning purposes, the group will plan on a \$1.5 Million budget for the first year of the program – Participants are tasked with speaking with various Boards and representatives to see how much money would be available as potential contributions to the program – Explore participation from other sectors not currently represented (dredgers, Caltrans)

10.	<p>Action: Criteria for Participation</p> <p>The concept of adequate participation only comes into play where permit requirements mandate program participation. The group discussed the Central Valley Salinity Coalition (CVSALTS) as a potential model but felt more specificity should be included than was in the CVSALTS document provided for review. Active program participation can potentially consist of funding, in-kind contributions, and constructively engaged Committee participants that are making the program run more efficiently by being prepared, bringing in ideas, etc.</p> <p>The Steering Committee questioned how participation would be measured in terms of accounting for in-kind contributions versus cash contributions.</p> <p>Jay Davis explained that in the Bay RMP, really it's about the fees that come in to the program. Not all groups participate in meetings regularly but they make their contributions. The theory is that there is incentive for participants to be actively involved in the program to ensure the program addresses their interest and thus increases the value of their contributions. A suggestion was made to look at the two-sentence definition of participation detailed in the Mercury Exposure Reduction Program. There was also a suggestion to set a minimum dollar amount and then acknowledge different types of contributions that would support that amount, within a guiding structure established by the SC.</p> <p>There was agreement in principle about how to monitor participation – by trying to monetize program activities based on tasks in a program workplan and that each sector (and participant in each sector) would be assessed a monetary contribution. In-kind contributions would be costed out to dollar amounts and credited to a sector by the amount of money saved to the RMP. Staff will draft the proposed criteria for participation to present to the SC.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Establish a monetary amount for each sector required as an active participant in the program. – Develop written criteria for adequate participation
11.	<p>Action: SC Transition to Co-Chairs</p> <p>Funding for Brock Bernstein's facilitation allows for up to three additional meetings. The major programmatic decisions (related to program design, funding, and participation) should be made or at least well structured within this time frame. As such, the SC will need to transition to elected Co-Chairs. The SC agreed to target an</p>

	<p>election of Co-Chairs two meetings from now and discuss the procedure for that election at the next meeting. Staff will prepare more detailed responsibilities for the SC Co-Chairs.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify the roles and tasks of the co-chairs - Establish a process for the election of co-chairs - Select Co-Chairs within the next two meetings
12.	<p>Plus/Delta</p> <p>Delta: Clearly and explicitly note the agreements along the way in real time. More introduction for the new people</p> <p>Plus: Everyone has been super positive Meeting materials in advance and nicely embedded in agenda</p>
13.	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>The next meeting has been tentatively scheduled for September 29 (9:30 am -3:30 pm at the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District). Meeting topics will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) TAC update 2) Roles and Responsibilities 3) Criteria for active participation 4) Election and transition to SC co-chairs 5) Program Funding
14.	<p>Action items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1. Distribute the subgroup design tables electronically to SC members 7.2. Revise and refine the roles and responsibilities document based on SC comments 7.3. Develop tracking tool (based on Bay RMP scorecard) for use with the Delta RMP 7.4. Develop a clearer picture of the costs of various program administration tasks, including data management 7.5. Develop accounting of contributions to date 7.6. Distribute data summit reports, once available, to the SC for review and discuss need for a data management subcommittee 7.7. Draft 'Criteria for Participation' document 7.8. Develop responsibilities for the SC Co-Chairs and a procedure for election of

	Co-Chairs
--	-----------

Adequate Participation in the Delta RMP

Adequate participation implies financial participation.

- The total program budget will be set by the Steering Committee.
- Each participant group will be responsible to fund a certain percent of the total program budget. These percentages will be negotiated by the Steering Committee.
- Each participant group will develop their own formula for the expected contribution for each of its members using objective measures such as: total population in service area (e.g. stormwater), load allocations (as in the Delta MeHg TMDL or the Bay RMP), or total volume of water discharged (e.g., POTWs).
- A participant will be deemed to have adequate participation in the Delta RMP if they contribute funds to the program equal to or exceeding their expected contribution.
- In-kind contributions may count towards a participant's contribution, but only if they can be monetized and replace a cost that the program would have to pay otherwise. An in-kind contribution would need to meet two basic yet fundamental criteria:
 - a. It has to replace an expense in the approved program budget.
 - b. It has to be voted on and agreed to by the SC.
 - c. Staff time at program meetings shall not be considered an in-kind contribution.

Steering Committee

The core responsibilities and authorities of the Steering Committee (SC) are to determine the overall budget, allocate program funds, track progress, and provide direction to the Program from a manager's perspective. The SC will meet quarterly.

The Delta RMP Steering Committee is the key decision-making authority of the Delta RMP. The Steering Committee is responsible for establishing the RMP's strategic direction and the policies and procedures that govern its operation. The Steering Committee may direct RMP staff and/or advisory committees to assist in meeting the RMP's objectives and may delegate the day-to-day functions of the RMP to the RMP's implementing entity.

The Steering Committee authorizes the implementation of agreements among the participating members and, specifically:

1. Directs the fiscal/operating agent to request and receive federal, state, local, and private funds from any source and to expend those moneys to accomplish the Delta RMP's goals
2. Approves budgets and expenditures
3. Directs the fiscal/operating agent to enter into partnerships, contracts, and other legal agreements on behalf of the Delta RMP, as necessary to fulfill the Delta RMP's mission
4. Approves Delta RMP work products and any other plans, products, or resolutions of the Delta RMP
5. Sets priorities and oversee the activities of the Stakeholder and Technical Advisory Committees
6. Establishes and oversees the implementation of policies and procedures necessary to the day-to-day functioning of the Delta RMP

Membership on the Steering Committee will not diminish the regulatory responsibilities or authority of any participating agency or organization.

SC co-Chairs

SC co-Chairs are part of the SC, whose responsibilities are to establish policies and procedures that govern its operation. Co-chairs serve as chair of the meetings, facilitating discussion, and encouraging members to participate in discussions. At the end of the meeting, the chair recaps what the group has agreed upon, including who has what responsibility. The co-chairs have an oversight role and are responsible for the overall functioning of the committee. Specific tasks should be assigned to staff.

Technical Advisory Committee

Under direction of the Steering Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) provides technical oversight of the RMP. It consists of technical representatives from the RMP membership groups, with technical and administrative support from RMP staff¹. The TAC makes recommendations to the Steering Committee based on technical evaluation of proposed or existing program elements. The Steering Committee then considers TAC recommendations in formulating their decisions. The TAC will meet as needed, at a minimum quarterly.

The purpose of the TAC is to provide oversight of the technical content and quality of the RMP.

The responsibilities of the TAC are to:

- assist the Steering Committee in developing, reviewing, and revising the Delta RMP's monitoring and special studies in line with the management questions;
- report to the Steering Committee on technical issues and guide the development of white papers as requested by the Steering Committee;
- select and convene subgroups to provide guidance on specific technical issues, with

¹ Currently, staff from the Central Valley Regional Water Board and Aquatic Science Center have been specifically assigned to work on the Delta RMP and are funded by the State Water Board.

- members drawn from both within and outside the TAC, as needed, to include specialized scientific or technical expertise not fully represented on the TAC;
- provide technical review and recommendations to the Steering Committee on project proposals;
 - provide technical review and recommendations to the Steering Committee on policies being considered for adoption, and;
 - provide technical review of the planning, development, and publication of RMP communication products, including the Pulse of the Delta report.

The TAC consists of experts in water quality, estuarine science, and related fields who are able to provide scientific opinions on the broad range of subject areas related to the Delta RMP's activities. Finally, TAC members work collaboratively to examine technical issues and develop advice and recommendations for the Steering Committee.

TAC Structure

TAC members will be drawn from RMP membership groups represented on the Steering Committee, but are not limited to these. Each designated SC member designates one person to sit on the TAC. Thus, the voting membership of the TAC consists of technical representatives of the groups represented on the SC.

Membership on the TAC is for a two-year term. The number of terms served by an individual is not limited but membership on the TAC must be renewed. The members of the TAC will appoint a Chair for a two-year term². A qualified Chair has a broad understanding of scientific issues in the Delta and can provide strong leadership, meeting management, and direction to the group.

In particular instances (e.g., a represented group has only a few staff with the appropriate expertise), a SC member or alternate may serve on the TAC. If a particular issue comes up that

² The exceptions are the initial TAC co-chairs, which were selected by the SC and charged with forming the TAC.

may create a conflict of interest, the SC member serving on the TAC would recuse themselves from decisions on the SC.

A conflict of interest may also arise if members of the TAC or its subgroups have a direct financial interest in a funding recommendation or decision (e.g., a consultant or researcher intending to bid on a contract for a proposed program activity). The participation of local scientists in planning processes can bring tremendous value to the Program, but the Program needs to ensure that the monitoring that is recommended and performed is not inappropriately biased by scientists that may have a conflict of interest. In cases where a conflict of interest exists, the TAC or subcommittee members will recuse themselves from funding recommendations. External peer review of workplans and products by scientists with no financial interest in the work to be done is essential not only to attaining high standards of scientific rigor, but also provides a mechanism for preventing the inappropriate influence of scientists with a conflict of interest.

Delta RMP staff act as the liaison between the Steering Committee, the TAC, and the TAC subcommittees. During the design period, the TAC co-chairs provide the communication link between the SC and the TAC and will be assisted by Delta RMP staff (SFEI-ASC) as needed.

TAC co-Chairs

The co-chairs coordinate the TAC's oversight of the technical content and quality of the RMP, co-chair TAC meetings, and help to ensure review of all program proposals and technical products. During the design period, they will also provide a communication link between the SC and TAC and help to ensure consistencies and resolve timing and scheduling issues between the SC, TAC, and subcommittees.

More specific roles of the TAC co-chairs:

- During the design period, communicate regularly with program staff and TAC

subcommittees to ensure deadlines are met and the monitoring plan is developing consistently across all committees

- In coordination with staff, develop meeting agendas and meeting materials at least two weeks in advance of each meeting
- Co-facilitate meetings to ensure agenda is covered, meeting is on time, and participants are given ample opportunities to participate
- Facilitate decisions and help ensure that decisions and recommendations are documented,

Flexibility

The TAC may recommend adding subcommittees as appropriate. If there is need for additional expertise, expert subcommittees may be formed that report to the TAC. The expert subcommittees may be drawn from the organizations represented on the Steering Committee but are not limited to these. Experts may be drawn from a variety of sectors, e.g. academia, NGOs, government agencies, and industry. In addition, the TAC may advise ASC to convene appropriate science advisory panels and/or independent experts to provide science advice on specific projects, initiatives, reports, and studies.

Other Stakeholders

All meetings of the Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee are open to the public. Stakeholders that are not RMP participants will have the opportunity to weigh in by participating in meetings and providing additional project and product review. Stakeholders may also participate in specific technical subcommittees.

Implementing Entity

The implementing entity oversees and administers the Delta RMP. Currently, the implementing entity is the San Francisco Estuary Institute – Aquatic Science Center. The general

responsibilities of the implementing entity are:

- Coordinate program activities;
- Coordinate with program participants, collaborating agencies and organizations, and participating laboratories;
- Act as the liaison between the Steering Committee, the TAC, and the TAC

subcommittees;

- Coordinate peer review activities;
- Program management and administration;
- Sampling coordination and logistics;
- Data management; and

• Analysis, assessment, and reporting.

Roster

<u>Steering Committee</u>		
<u>Participant Group</u>	<u>Current Representative(s)</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
<u>Regulatory - State</u>	<u>Kenneth Landau</u> <u>Alternates:</u> <u>Pamela Creedon</u>	<u>Central Valley Regional Water Board</u>
<u>Regulatory - Federal</u>	<u>Tim Vendlinski</u> <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Valentina Cabrera-Stagno</u>	<u>U.S. EPA Region 9 Water Division</u>
<u>Coordinated Monitoring</u>	<u>Gregg Erickson</u> <u>Alternates:</u> <u>Erwin van Nieuwenhuysse</u> <u>Karen Gehrts</u>	<u>Interagency Ecological Program</u> <u>U.S. Bureau of Reclamation</u> <u>Department of Water Resources</u>
<u>Stormwater, Phase I</u>	<u>Dave Tamayo</u> <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Dalia Fadl</u>	<u>County of Sacramento</u> <u>City of Sacramento</u>
<u>Stormwater, Phase II</u>	<u>Stephanie Reyna-Hiestand</u> <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Brandon Nakagawa</u>	<u>City of Tracy</u> <u>San Joaquin County</u>
<u>POTWs</u>	<u>Linda Dorn</u> <u>Erich Delmas</u> <u>Casey Wichert</u> <u>Alternates:</u> <u>Debbie Webster</u> <u>Tony Pirondini</u> <u>Nader Shareghi</u> <u>Jenny Skrel</u> <u>Jason Lofton</u> <u>Vyomini Pandya</u> <u>Josie Tellers</u>	<u>Regional San</u> <u>City of Tracy</u> <u>City of Brentwood</u> <u>CVCWA</u> <u>City of Vacaville</u> <u>Mountain House WWTP</u> <u>Ironhouse Sanitary District</u> <u>Regional San</u> <u>City of Davis</u>

<u>Steering Committee</u>		
<u>Participant Group</u>	<u>Current Representative(s)</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
	<u>Margaret Orr</u>	<u>City of Stockton</u>
<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>Mike Wackman</u> <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Bruce Houdesheldt</u>	<u>San Joaquin County and Delta WQ Coalition</u> <u>Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition</u>
<u>Water Supply</u>	<u>Val Connor</u> <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Stephanie Fong</u>	<u>SFWCA</u>
<u>Resource Agencies</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>

<u>Technical Advisory Committee</u>		
<u>Participant Group</u>	<u>Current Representative(s)</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
<u>Regulatory - State</u>	<u>Meghan Sullivan</u> <u>Alternates:</u> <u>Tessa Fojut</u>	<u>Central Valley Regional Water Board</u>
<u>Regulatory - Federal</u>	<u>Debra Denton</u> <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Valentina Cabrera-Stagno</u>	<u>U.S. EPA Region 9 Water Division</u>
<u>Coordinated Monitoring</u>	<u>Shaun Philippart</u> <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Erwin van Nieuwenhuyse</u>	<u>Department of Water Resources</u> <u>U.S. Bureau of Reclamation</u>
<u>Stormwater, Phase I</u>	<u>Brian Laurenson</u> <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Vacant</u>	<u>LWA</u>
<u>Stormwater, Phase II</u>	<u>Karen Ashby</u> <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Gerardo Dominguez</u>	<u>LWA</u> <u>San Joaquin County</u>
<u>POTWs</u>	<u>Lisa Thompson</u> <u>Vyomini Pandya</u> <u>Tony Pirondini</u> <u>Alternates:</u> <u>Vacant</u>	<u>Regional San</u> <u>Regional San</u> <u>City of Vacaville</u>
<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>Claus Suverkropp</u> <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Vacant</u>	<u>LWA</u>
<u>Water Supply</u>	<u>Stephanie Fong</u> <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Vacant</u>	<u>SFWCA</u>
<u>TAC co-Chairs</u>	<u>Joe Domagalski</u> <u>Stephen McCord</u>	<u>USGS</u> <u>MEI</u>

<u>TAC Subcommittees</u>	
<u>Current Use Pesticides</u>	
<u>Members</u>	<u>Claus Suverkropp, Larry Walker Associates</u> <u>Dawit Tadesse, State Water Resources Control Board</u> <u>Jim Orlando, USGS</u> <u>Joseph Domagalski, USGS</u> <u>Rachel Kubiak, Western Plant Health Association</u> <u>Tessa Fojut, Central Valley Regional Water Board</u> <u>Vyomini Upadhyay, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District</u> <u>Xin Deng, California Department of Pesticide Regulation</u>
<u>Chairs</u>	<u>Debra Denton, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9</u> <u>Stephanie Fong, State and Federal Water Contractors Water Agency</u>
<u>Staff</u>	<u>Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board</u> <u>Thomas Jabusch, San Francisco Estuary Institute/Aquatic Science Center</u>
<u>Mercury</u>	
<u>Members</u>	<u>Carol DiGiorgio, California Department of Water Resources</u> <u>Darrell Slotton, UC Davis</u> <u>Jacob Fleck, U.S. Geological Survey</u> <u>Janis Cooke, Central Valley Regional Water Board</u> <u>JR Flanders, URS</u> <u>Karen Ashby, Larry Walker Associates</u> <u>Mark Stephenson, Moss Landing Marine Laboratories</u> <u>Tony Pirondini, City of Vacaville</u> <u>Vyomini Upadhyay, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District</u> <u>Wes Heim, Moss Landing Marine Laboratories</u>
<u>Chair</u>	<u>Stephen McCord, McCord Environmental, Inc.</u>
<u>Staff</u>	<u>April Robinson, San Francisco Estuary Institute/Aquatic Science Center</u> <u>Jay Davis, San Francisco Estuary Institute/Aquatic Science Center</u> <u>Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board</u> <u>Thomas Jabusch, San Francisco Estuary Institute/Aquatic Science Center</u>

<u>TAC Subcommittees</u>	
<u>Nutrients</u>	
<u>Members</u>	Brian Bergamaschi, USGS Chris Foe, Central Valley Regional Water Board Erwin Van Nieuwenhuyse, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Lisa Thompson, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Lynda Smith, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Rachel Kubiak, Western Plant Health Association Renee Pinel, Western Plant Health Association Stephanie Fong, State and Federal Water Contractors Water Agency Tim Mussen, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Tom Grovhoug, Larry Walker Associates
<u>Chair</u>	Joseph Domagalski, USGS
<u>Staff</u>	David Senn, San Francisco Estuary Institute/Aquatic Science Center Phil Trowbridge, San Francisco Estuary Institute/Aquatic Science Center Thomas Jabusch, San Francisco Estuary Institute/Aquatic Science Center
<u>Pathogens</u>	
<u>Members</u>	Cindy Garcia, California Department of Water Resources Debbie Webster, CVCWA Elaine Archibald, California Urban Water Agencies Jay Simi, Central Valley Regional Water Board John Dickey, Plan Tierra LLC Lynda Smith, Metropolitan Water District Lysa Voight, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Roberta Firoved, California Rice Commission Steven San Julian, California Department of Water Resources Sue McConnell, Central Valley Regional Water Board Tom Grovhoug, Larry Walker Associates Vyomini Upadhyay, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Timothy Mussen, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
<u>Chair</u>	Brian Laurenson

<i>TAC Subcommittees</i>	
<u>Staff</u>	<u>Hope McCaslin Taylor, Larry Walker Associates</u> <u>Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board</u> <u>Thomas Jabusch, San Francisco Estuary Institute/Aquatic Science Center</u>